



Donna Poreda

From: johnlu
To: bradsi
Subject: RE: Thoughts about the retreat
Date: Monday, June 14, 1993 4:54PM

the cairo client side has a lot of overlap with shadowing (dfs replication), security (kerberos), net browsing (directory/ofs), mgmt.

if i am a psg-focused guy, i think "gosh, cairo is going to slip more than we all anticipate, we need to build these capabilities independent of cairo and ship them asap".

if i am a synergistic guy, i think "gee, we should synch up this design work with cairo client code so that we don't do it twice. they probably understand some of these problems better than we do anyway. and we will get more bang for the buck since cairo's notes capabilities will be a major marketing push, whereas chicago workgroup capabilities will be a modest marketing push."

where are you on the spectrum?

From: bradsi
To: bradsi; davidcol; dennisad; johnlu
Subject: RE: Thoughts about the retreat
Date: Monday, June 14, 1993 1:19PM

I made the point of putting cairo server side support hosted on chicago in my session but they were immediately discarded by billg and the others. numerous times. i did get them to see how important it was to have cairo-client side stuff on chicago, and it was agreed we'd do for the cairo

|release (perhaps even shipped with cairo). the cairo strategy is first and

|foremost based on getting a lot of cairo clients. i think this is a mistake

|and will fail. if the only thing that can take advantage of cairo is other

|cairo clients, we are dead. i gave the example of nw4: you get nw4 client capabilities (dfs, security) on dos, mac, windows, unix etc. and we're just

|going to be on cairo? hah. you have to give windows clients some real benefit when there is a cairo server and give them a taste of how much even

|better things would be with cairo clients.

on the shell, in fact, it could play into novell's hands. they could get lotus, borland, wordperfect et al together to develop their own common shell. soon as we put the shell into play as an app, we open ourselves us.

|you can bet novell would get a lot of support from isv's.

From: johnlu
To: bradsi; davidcol; dennisad
Subject: RE: Thoughts about the retreat
Date: Monday, June 14, 1993 11:42AM

i don't think unbundling the shell helps us very much in our novell competitive battle. our major advantage versus novell is our end-user franchise. if we push all the cool end-user stuff like the shell and doc mgmt stuff to office, then i fear we just make it easier for novell to compete with us in these areas.

on a related note, we were in general pretty smug about our position versus

novell at this retreat. i think we have a lot more to be scared about. they are going to bundle up all their object goo and tools investments into

a cairo response, and they are going to make it available on every platform.

we are not currently on a path to have cairo technologies on any platform but cairo. notes will also be on every platform. we really need a plan

to

make client-side cairo capabilities available on chicago, and maybe server-side capabilities too. this would be a post-chicago release but we probably need to start building it pre-chicago release if we plan to have it

done when cairo ships.

From: Dennis Adler
To: bradsi; davidcol; johnlu
Subject: RE: Thoughts about the retreat
Date: Monday, June 14, 1993 11:09AM

I discussed this point w/ Paulma on the flight back from the retreat. He agrees that it is a double-edged sword that is VERY sharp. Billg and Peteh seemed to think that if other ISVs shipping their own shell becomes an issue, we quickly drop the Office shell into the Windows box. Quickly and Windows box are a wonderful oxymoron. History shows it takes us 18-24 months to ship a major Windows update. This is a long time to let people party around on our shell. A moiror Window supdate would not solve the problem as it would not get onto enough desktops to stem the tide.

This could be less risky if we do copyright/patent our shell and are aggressive about not letting people clone it; not clear if we could do that though... it'd require lawyer input.

From: Brad Silverberg
To: Brad Silverberg; David Cole; Dennis Adler; John Ludwig
Subject: RE: Thoughts about the retreat
Date: Monday, June 14, 1993 10:36AM

also, why i understand the motivation for having office ship it's own shell,

it's not something i feel comfortable with. it will have huge ramifications. we could lose control of the windows ui as every other

isv

feels compelled to ship their own shell. how can we rev the ui then?